

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claim 1 has been amended and claim 30 has been added. Claims 2, 4-5, and 8-13 were previously canceled and claims 17 and 26 were previously withdrawn. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1, 3, 6-7, 14-16, 18-25, and 27-30 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action dated November 24, 2008, claims 1, 3, 6-7, 14-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,361,163 to Matsuda et al. ("Matsuda"). Claims 20-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,485 to Moon ("Moon"). It is noted that claim 1 has been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants hereby traverse the rejections as follows.

A. Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 14-16, 18-19, and 29

The Applicants' invention as now set forth in amended claim 1 is directed to a display panel for amplifying light reflection intensity, including at least the combination of a substrate, at least one protrusion disposed on a surface of the substrate, a light reflective layer on the surface of the protrusion, wherein the light reflective layer comprises programmable code information and the protrusion amplifies the light reflection intensity such that the programmable code information is optimally detected.

Fig. 4(a-d) of the present invention illustrates an exemplary placement of the substrate (41), protrusion (43), and light reflective layer (44). The protrusion (43) is on

the surface of the substrate (41), and the light reflective layer (44) is on the surface of the protrusion (43).

Matsuda discloses a substrate (511) and a protrusion (412, 512) disposed on the substrate (411, 511). However, Matsuda teaches that the light reflective layer (421, 553) is located on the opposite side of the substrate (411, 511) than the protrusion (412, 512), whereas the invention recited in claim 1 includes a light reflective layer **on the surface of the protrusion**. See Figs. 22, and 26-28 of Matsuda. Thus, Matsuda does not disclose or suggest a light reflective layer (412, 553) on the surface of the protrusion (412, 512).

In addition, Matsuda discloses a register mark (531), which the Office Action asserts is the "programmable code information," is formed on substrate 511 rather than on the reflective layer as in claim 1. (See column 36, lines 60-65 of Matsuda).

Thus, Matsuda does not disclose or suggest the light reflective layer comprising programmable code information and the protrusion amplifies the light reflection intensity such that the programmable code information is optimally detected, as recited in claim 1.

For at least this combination of reasons, the Applicants submit that Matsuda does not disclose every element of amended claim 1.

Moon fails to cure the deficiency in Matsuda.

For at least this combination of reasons, the Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 3, 6-7, 14-16, 18-19, and 29, which depend from allowable claim 1, are

therefore also allowable for at least the above noted reasons and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

B. Claims 20-25 and 28

Applicants' invention as now set forth in amended claim 20 is directed to a liquid crystal display panel comprising a substrate, a plurality of protrusions disposed on the substrate, a light reflective layer disposed on a surface of the plurality of protrusions, wherein the light reflective layer comprises programmable code information, a light shielding layer disposed on a surface of the light reflective layer opposite the plurality of protrusions, and a plurality of color filters, wherein the color filters are spaced apart with the light shielding layer and the light reflective layer.

Thus, the color filters "are spaced apart with a reflective layer and a light shielding layer." Fig. 3 of the present application illustrates exemplary color filters 35, wherein the color filters 35 are spaced apart with the light shielding layer (34) and the light reflective layer (33).

The Office Action admits that Matsuda fails to disclose a plurality of color filters. The Office Action cites Moon, Fig. 5 as disclosing this feature.

In contrast to claim 20, Moon discloses color filters (132) separating a light shielding layer (134) and a pixel electrode (138, that the Examiner asserts may be reflective).

In claim 20, the light shielding and light reflective layers are located between color filters. In Moon, the light shielding layers (134) are not located between color filters. In Moon, the light reflective layer and the light shielding layer do not "space apart" adjacent color filters, as recited in claim 20.

Additionally, Matsuda fails to disclose that the light reflective layer is disposed on the plurality of protrusions and that the light reflective layer comprises programmable code information. As discussed above for claim 1, the light reflecting layer (421) in Matsuda is separated from the surface of the protrusion (412) by the substrate (411) and the register mark (531) in Matsuda is located on the substrate 511 not comprised in the light reflective layer, as in claim 20.

For at least this combination of reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 20 is allowable over the cited art. As claim 20 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 21-25 and 27-28, which depend from allowable claim 20, are therefore also allowable for at least the above noted reasons and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

C. Claim 30

Claim 30 recites that two adjacent color filters are spaced apart by the light shielding layer and the light reflective layer. Thus, the light shielding layer and the light reflective layer are located between two adjacent color filters, as illustrated in Fig. 3 of the present application. As discussed above, Moon discloses a light shielding layer on one side of a color filter and a light reflective layer on the other side of the color filter, but does not disclose or suggest both a light shielding layer and a light reflective layer located between two adjacent color filters.

Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 30 is allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 025789-00006.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sheree Rowe". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Sheree" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Rowe".

Sheree Rowe
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,068

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6000
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395